

## REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 26, 2008. Claims 28-47 are presented for examination, of which Claims 28 and 38 are in independent form. No claim amendments are presented herein. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 28-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,917,969 (*Aggarwal et al.*) in view of a document entitled “Understanding JavaServer Pages Model 2 Architecture” (*Seshadri*) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0039990 (*Bakar et al.*). For at least the reasons presented below, Applicants submit that independent Claim 28, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited references.

As noted in the previous Amendment filed on August 27, 2008, the aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 28 is directed to a method for providing standardized input interface elements using Extensible Markup Language (XML) including receiving a request for a webpage and a first file corresponding to the webpage. An XML tag including a field name is obtained from the first file and used to obtain from a second file a formatting instruction corresponding to the field name. Program code corresponding to an input interface element specified in the formatting instruction is then formatted. The program code is configured to enable a value corresponding to the field name to be input via the input interface element. A third file including the program code corresponding to the input interface element is generated and then transmitted using a communications network.

Notable features of Claim 28 include “using the XML tag to obtain, from a second file, a formatting instruction corresponding to the field name” and “formatting program

code corresponding to an input interface element specified in the formatting instruction, wherein the program code is configured to enable a value corresponding to the field name to be input via the input interface element.” By virtue of these features, a system implementing the method of Claim 28 provides standardized input interface elements for webpages.

*Aggarwal et al.* relates to cross-platform rendering of content in variable presentation environments. *Seshadri* relates to a Model-View Controller design for separating presentation from content using JavaServer Pages (JSP). Applicants agree with the Office Action’s assertion that the combination of *Aggarwal et al.* and *Seshadri* does not expressly teach “using the XML tag to obtain, from a second file, a formatting instruction corresponding to the field name” and “formatting program code corresponding to an input interface element specified in the formatting instruction, wherein the program code is configured to enable a value corresponding to the field name to be input via the input interface element.” Applicants disagree, however, with the contention that *Bakar et al.* discloses those features.

*Bakar et al.*, as best understood by Applicants, relates to an automated form and data analysis tool that provides mechanisms for developing, maintaining, and manipulating forms, and for extracting information from the forms. The Office Action cites *Bakar et al.*, at paragraphs [0064] and [0091], as disclosing the above-mentioned features of Claim 28. Paragraph [0064] deals with an export engine that enables a user to perform various tasks (*e.g.*, creating, saving, and running export actions) associated with exporting data, which has been input to a database via forms. Paragraph [0091] deals with various components of an export module. Apparently, an exporting template may include fields required in an export. In contrast to Claim 28, however, the fields mentioned in *Bakar et al.* are not understood to be included in an XML tag. Moreover, Applicants have found no mention of XML tags at all in *Bakar et al.*,

much less “using the XML tag to obtain, from a second file, a formatting instruction corresponding to the field name,” as recited in Claim 28. Finally, while paragraph [0091] states “the exporting engine 320 may render XML code or a text file by applying an XSL style sheet to the XML code,” Applicants submit that this cannot reasonably be said to disclose “formatting program code corresponding to an input interface element specified in the formatting instruction,” as recited in Claim 28. Indeed, this portion of *Bakar et al.* makes no mention of “an input interface element” or “a formatting instruction,” much less “an interface element specified in [a] formatting instruction.”

Nothing has been found in *Bakar et al.* (in the cited portions or in the document as a whole) that is believed to teach or suggest “using the XML tag to obtain, from a second file, a formatting instruction corresponding to the field name” and “formatting program code corresponding to an input interface element specified in the formatting instruction, wherein the program code is configured to enable a value corresponding to the field name to be input via the input interface element,” as recited in Claim 28. Further, Applicants submit that any combination of *Aggarwal et al.*, *Seshadri*, and *Bakar et al.*, assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest “using the XML tag to obtain, from a second file, a formatting instruction corresponding to the field name” and “formatting program code corresponding to an input interface element specified in the formatting instruction, wherein the program code is configured to enable a value corresponding to the field name to be input via the input interface element,” as recited in Claim 28. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 28 is patentable over the cited art, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent Claim 38 includes features similar to those discussed above in connection with Claim 28, and is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. The other rejected claims in this application depend from Claim 28 or Claim 38 and therefore are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

This Response After Final Action is believed clearly to place the present application in condition for allowance. Therefore, entry of this Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is believed proper and is respectfully requested, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Response. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Response timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 50-3939.

CONCLUSION

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lock See Yu-Jahnes/

---

Lock See Yu-Jahnes  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCBS\_WS 2691784\_1